

10/17/67

Dear Maggie,

Dirty handed, waterless, without current hence light, hi! We're still in the throes of moving in, bogged down in the bureaucracy of the utilities which, snare by snare, I have to unthread, and with the view from my window, once magnificent, today of a deep gash in the earth two utility trucks, two TV installer's trucks, and a number of cars I cannot count. Good day for letter writing, not for other kinds.

I hope Steve has relayed to you my tentative plans. I wrote him in haste last night, when I learned them, hoping he could formalize the speech at UCLA 11/15. That morning I expect to arrive. I'll go to N.O. about 11/5, thence to Chicago, thence San Francisco. If Liebelier was uneasy over my other writing, wait until he sees OSWALD IN NEW ORLEANS! I think this time he'll have to say something, and I hope you people can line up things as well as last time so I can make it more uncomfortable for him to avoid. This book has what he had and didn't use, what he would have been led to had he any willingness to seek the truth, the fact not consistent with the predetermined case...I hope also when I'm there that we can have some time to chat, and without the arguments that we began with last time. I hope nothing is bugging Ray. I've not heard from him for a while. I want to be able to tell you what I now have, in the same small group. I assume it will be arranged so that, if we can get together privately, it will exclude Lifton. Would not your presence assure this? If someone does undertake to arrange something of this sort and wants to avoid personal embarrassment, can it be put on the basis that I absolutely insist on your presence? More than anyone else, I in fact do want to talk to you. If we cannot do it any other way, perhaps with just Bill, if a large group cannot be private enough.

I do not believe the stuff on 1026 either. It was my hunch that this document represented part of a coverup and had that value.

What you say about the Armoni article express my sentiments, but not exactly. I have a stronger feeling about the dishonesty and I so told him. He sent me a marked copy of the magazine, to which I do not subscribe. My initial experience was so utterly shocking (almost two years ago) that in respect for his past and his decent objectives, I just fell silent and ignored him. I wondered if Sylvia had asked him to send it to me (he had my last name close to phonetic) and, indeed, if she had drafted the piece. She will not like my response. I also wrote her separately asking her to closely examine herself to see if she can find an emotional involvement in this, for her speaking, thinking and writing are so unlike her when she addresses Garrison. We have had several rather stiff exchanges, including a rather emotional personal confrontation last time I was in New York. She is also straining at gnats in the few instances where she is on other than imaginary grounds. I asked her to preserve silence until she read my New Orleans book, but that also she would not do. Having made herself heard, having said what she had to say, she now repeats the same charges whenever she can, adding nothing but repetition. This disturbs me, very much,

She is wrong on his going out on his way to "court" the critics, of course. What she might have said is that he welcomed us. What is wrong or unnatural about that? Where else is he to get help? He has never written me, phoned me fewer than a half dozen time, and not once for "courtship"!

Your position on the trial is the same as mine. I said this on leaving the grand-jury room 4/28, as I wish others had, for then the possibility of the trial coming

off and the decision sticking both would be greater. I wish I had a tape of what I then said. ABC taped me for an hour, right on the stair, and it was pretty hot for a while, simply because I could not be cajoled or pressured into making the kind of comment they wanted (and would sell books). I was promised a copy.

Perhaps most troubling to me of all is my conviction that if it should turn out that Garrison's motives are doubtful (and I do not consider this at all probable), this cannot make Sylvia right in what she has done. I also fear its ultimate effect on her, when she comes to realize it. I have been aware of the breach between you and save for a few possibly strong hints to her have been silent, hoping thereby to not widen it. And when I told her that when she saw my book, with nothing from Garrison in it, she'd see a prima facie case, she declined to believe me. I tried to tell her that he, certainly, had more than I gave him, and if I had close to enough enough to satisfy reasonable people on probability, there should be little doubt about his case. I have two worries: whether the case has been made untriable and whether the proper protections of the law can be distorted to the same end. I have no doubt on the central fact.

I am making arrangements, as soon as Steve replies, to have a supply of C in N.C. available to you all, without charge. Someone will have to pick them up at the wholesaler's, that is all. Perhaps Steve can do that and subdivide.

As soon as my plans are more definite, I'll be writing Bill or Steve. I addressed Steve because he is trying to line up the speech.

Looking forward to seeing you all again!

Best regards,